

## **APPLICANTS' STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW**

A telephonic interview was held on February 12, 2007 among Examiner Phillip Gambel, Examiner Chun Crowder, Dr. Timothy Mayer of MacroGenics, Inc. (“MacroGenics”), owner of the instant application, and Drs. Margaret Brivanlou and Richard Enmon, Jr., attorney and attorney’s patent agent for MacroGenics, respectively. Applicants wish to thank Examiners Gambel and Crowder for the courtesy extended to the Applicants’ representatives. During the interview the outstanding rejections in the Office Action were discussed.

Dr. Brivanlou discussed the outstanding rejections of the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Dr. Brivanlou presented evidence that the term “endogenous,” as used in the instant claims, had a meaning in the context of the specification consistent with its art-specific meaning that had not been appreciated by the Examiner and which distinguished the instant claims over the antibodies of the prior art. In particular, Dr. Brivanlou pointed to the specification and a technical dictionary of biochemistry and molecular biology, which each distinguished the endogenous expression of a protein from the recombinant expression of a protein. Dr. Brivanlou also indicated that, when viewed by one of ordinary skill in the art, such a distinction was also fully consistent with the definition of “endogenous” cited by the Examiner in the outstanding Office Action. Examiners Crowder and Gambel indicated that they would fully consider all such arguments presented in this response.